



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,641	04/06/2001	Charles E. Jagger	28349/37268	9029

4743 7590 05/08/2007  
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP  
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300  
SEARS TOWER  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER
----------

SCHEIBEL, ROBERT C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2616

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/08/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

84

# **Interview Summary**

**Application No.**

09/827,641

**Applicant(s)**

JAGGER ET AL.

**Examiner**

Robert C. Scheibel

**Art Unit**

2616

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Robert C. Scheibel.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Paul Stevens (Reg. No. 47,970).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 30 April 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. 6,035,213 (Tokuda et al).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant wanted to clarify the office's position with respect to the Final rejection mailed 2/21/2007. Examiner indicated that the office was giving a broad, but reasonable interpretation to the amended claim language and recommended that more specific language be included to overcome this rejection. Applicant will discuss the interview with his client and determine how to proceed in the prosecution of the case.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

*Seema S. Rao*  
SEEMA S. RAO 5/3/07

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

*Robert C. Scheibel*

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required